Docket No. 0630-1386P

August 12, 2004 Art Unit: 2188

Page 14 of 20

**REMARKS** 

Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application are

respectfully requested in view of the following remarks. Claims 3-7, 9-16, and 18-20

remain pending. Claims 3, 7, and 12 are independent.

SCOPE OF CLAIMS NOT ALTERED

Claims 3, 7, and 12 stand objected to for minor informalities. See Final Office

Action, page 2, Item 3. These claims have been amended (not strictly in the manner

suggested by the Examiner) merely to address the informal issues raised and to

enhance clarity. It is intended that the scope of the claims remain substantially the same.

§ 102 REJECTION – ITOI

Claims 3-7, 9-16, and 18-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly

being anticipated by Itoi (Publication No. US 2001/0012440). Applicant respectfully

traverses.

For a Section 102 rejection to be proper, the cited reference must teach or

suggest each and every claimed element. See M.P.E.P. 2131; M.P.E.P. 706.02. Thus,

if the cited reference fails to teach or suggest one or more elements, then the rejection

is improper and must be withdrawn.

In this instance, Itoi fails to teach or suggest each and every claimed element.

For example, independent claim 3 recites, in part "a first storage medium for storing the

received contents." Independent claims 7 and 12 also recite a first storage medium.

Docket No. 0630-1386P

August 12, 2004 Art Unit: 2188

Page 15 of 20

Contrary to the Examiner's assertion, Itoi cannot be relied upon to teach or suggest at

least this feature.

Itoi is directed toward a data decoding and recording apparatus which receives

and decodes a digital broadcast and records contents of the digital contrast. See Itoi,

paragraph 0002. Itoi discloses that the data decoding recording apparatus includes a

set top box (STB) 1, and a plurality of recording apparatus including a hard disk drive 2,

an optical disk drive 3, and a video tape recorder 4. See paragraph 0028. Itoi discloses

that the digital broadcasting radio wave is received and de-modulated by a tuner section

12, which outputs the resulting data as a transport stream TS as prescribed in the

MPEG-2. See paragraph 0031. Under the control of the general control section 11, the

transport stream TS may be recorded to one or more of the hard disk drive 2, optical

disk drive 3, and the video tape recorder 4. The general control section 11 first reads

the copy control code of the content to determine whether or not copying is allowed. Itoi

discloses that the copy control code is a two-bit code signifying free copying (00), single

copy only (10), and no copy allowed (01 or 11). See paragraph 0035.

If unlimited copying is allowed, i.e., the copy control code is 00, then the content

is recorded onto the hard disk drive 2. See paragraph 0038. If the control code indicates

no copy allowed, i.e., 01 or 11, the contents are not recorded to any of the recording

apparatus.

Docket No. 0630-1386P

August 12, 2004

Art Unit: 2188

Page 16 of 20

However, if the control code indicates that a single copy is allowed, i.e., control

code is 10, the contents are recorded to either the optical hard disk 3 or the video tape

recorder 4. See paragraph 0039. The control code of the contents written to either the

optical hard disk 3 or the video tape recorder 4 is then changed to 01 or 11,

representing inhibition of copying so that no further copying is allowed. See paragraph

0043.

In the final Office Action, the Examiner asserts that the tuner section 12, as

shown in Figure 1, is equivalent to the first storage medium as claimed. However, it is

noted that there is no storing function performed by the tuner section 12. Paragraph

0031, cited by the Examiner, merely discloses that the tuner section 12 receives the

digital broadcasting radio wave, performs decoding, and outputs the resulting data as

the transport stream TS. No separate storing function is performed by the tuner section

12. Therefore, Itoi cannot be relied upon to teach or suggest the first storage medium as

claimed in the independent claims.

Independent claim 3 also recites, in part, "mutual authentication is performed

between the first storage medium and the second storage medium." Independent claim

7 and 12 also recite a similar feature. Clearly, Itoi cannot be relied upon to teach or

suggest mutual authentication between the first and second storage mediums as

claimed since Itoi cannot be relied upon to teach or suggest the first storage medium as

claimed.

Docket No. 0630-1386P

August 12, 2004

Art Unit: 2188

Page 17 of 20

Further, the Examiner's statement with regards to the mutual authentication

feature is inconsistent. The Examiner states "the CPU has to perform the mutual

authentication before contents are recorded between STB and one of the recording

medium 2-4." See Final Office Action, page 4, lines 13-14. It is difficult to understand

how a single element CPU can perform mutual authentication. Clearly, this statement is

antithetical to itself. Therefore, Itoi cannot be relied upon to teach or suggest at least

this feature.

Further, the Examiner relied upon paragraph 0043 to assert that Itoi teaches

increasing by one time the possible number of copies of the contents as recited in

independent claims 3, 7 and 12. This reliance is misguided. Itoi specifically discloses

that the copy control code is changed from code indicating a single copy "10" to the

code indicating inhibition of copies "01 or 11" to achieve, in Itoi's own words, "to realize

permission of copying only once." In other words, Itoi merely discloses that the status of

the contents copying control code is changed from single copy allowed to no copies

allowed after the single copy is made to the optical disk 3 or to the video tape recorder 4.

Paragraph 0043 cannot be relied upon to teach or suggest increasing the possible

number of copies of the contents as claimed.

Independent claim 12 further recites "reading a set value of a moving

determination bit...if a user demands moving contents from a first storage medium to a

second storage medium." Emphasis added. In the final Office Action, the Examiner

Docket No. 0630-1386P

August 12, 2004

Art Unit: 2188

Page 18 of 20

asserts that the copy control code is equivalent to the moving determination bit as

claimed. This fails for at least the following reasons.

First, the copy control code as disclosed in Itoi merely indicates whether copying

of the contents will be allowed or not. The copy control code provides no information

whatsoever regarding whether a user desires for the actual copying to take place.

Clearly, the copy control code as disclosed in Itoi cannot be equivalent to the moving

determination bit as claimed. Second, Itoi cannot be relied upon to teach or suggest the

first storage medium as claimed. Thus, there can be no moving contents from the first

storage medium.

For at least the above stated reasons, independent claims 3, 7 and 12 are

distinguishable over Itoi. Claims 4-6, 9-11, 13-16 and 18-20 depend from independent

claims 3, 7 and 12 directly or indirectly. Therefore, for at least the reasons stated with

respect to independent claims 3, 7 and 12, these dependent claims are also

distinguishable over Itoi.

The dependent claims are also distinguishable over Itoi on their own merit. For

example, claims 4, 10, and 19 recite that the copy control code is converted to a single

copy if the copy control code is determined to indicate no copies. Again, the Examiner

reliance on paragraph 0043 of Itoi is misguided. More specifically, Itoi discloses that if

the copy control code indicates a single copy, the code is converted to no copies. This

is completely the reverse of the feature as recited in claims 4, 10, and 19.

Docket No. 0630-1386P

August 12, 2004 Art Unit: 2188

Page 19 of 20

Claims 5, 11, 13, and 16 recite that the processor deletes the original contents of

the first storage medium after the contents move to the second storage medium. As

noted above, Itoi does not teach or suggest the first storage medium as claimed.

Therefore, it logically follows that Itoi cannot be relied upon to teach or suggest deleting

the contents from the first storage medium as claimed. Also, the Examiner's reliance on

paragraph 0038 is misguided. Itoi discloses, in this paragraph, that the contents are

erased from the hard disk drive after time shift enjoyment is performed. However, by the

Examiner's own assertion, hard disk drive is equivalent to the second storage medium.

Thus, by even the Examiner's own admission, Itoi cannot be relied upon to teach or

suggest at least this feature.

Claim 14 recites, "wherein the moving determination bit is set using a bit of the

packet." The Examiner relies upon paragraph 0063 of Itoi to allegedly teach this feature.

However, this paragraph of Itoi merely discloses that some data streams may be stuffed

with stuffing bit. Again, this stuffing bit provides no information whatsoever regarding

whether or not the user has indicated that a copy is desired. Also, it is to be noted that

to the extent the Examiner is asserting the stuffing bit is equivalent to the moving

determination bit as claimed in claim 14, this rejection is inconsistent with the rejection

of independent claim 12, where the Examiner asserts that the copy control code is

equivalent to the moving determination bit. Therefore, Itoi cannot be relied upon to

teach or suggest at least this feature.

Docket No. 0630-1386P

August 12, 2004

Art Unit: 2188

Page 20 of 20

For at least the reasons stated above, all pending claims are distinguishable over

Itoi. Applicant respectfully request that the rejection of claims 3-7, 9-16, and 18-20

based on Itoi be withdrawn.

**CONCLUSION** 

All objections and rejections raised in the Final Office Action having been

addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for

allowance. Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved, the

Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Hyung Sohn (Reg. No. 44,346), to

conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present

application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and

future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No.

02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly,

extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH &, BIRCH, LLP

By: Esther W. Chong #40,953 James T. Eller, Jr. # 39,538

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, VA 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

JTE/HNS/lab 0630-1386P